DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 202 UD 022 698

AUTHOR	Syropoulos, Michael
TITLE	Evaluation of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center.
INSTITUTION	Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 80
NOTE	78p.; For related document see CS 006 770.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Analysis; Diagnostic Teaching; Elementary Secondary Education; Eligibility; *Learning Disabilities; Mathematics; Parent Participation; Pretests Posttests; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reading; Referral; Staff Role
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Michigan (Detroit); *Non Public Schools Learning Resource Center MI

ABSTRACT

This report presents 1979-80 evaluation findings of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center, in Detroit, Michigan. The center, funded by Title I, provided diagnostic/prescriptive-learning techniques to 1,400 students (in 27 non-public schools) who had learning difficulties in mathematics and reading. The first section of the report discusses: the project's rationale; its functions and responsibilities; eligibility criteria, the referral process; diagnostic and prescriptive procedures; parental involvement; and the process of student monitoring and documentation by staff members. The second section explains methods utilized to evaluate students (based on results of pre- and post-California Achievement Tests and the Stanford Diagnostic Test). The third section indicates how data was analyzed and evaluated after students were screened and diagnosed. Finally, section IV presents statistical tables that indicate student achievement by project objective. The project is said to have been effective in implementing the proposed activities and continuation is recommended. Appended to the report are samples of questionnaires administered to staff, teachers, and parents regarding their perceptions of the learning center, as well as a copy of the inservice training evaluation instrument. (WAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JoAnne E. Moore
Detroit Pub. Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED227202

EVALUATION
OF
THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

Funded Under

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Prepared by

Dr. M. Syropoulos, Project Evaluator
Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation
Department of Research and Evaluation

September 1980

UD 022 698

ABSTRACT

Title	:	Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center
Funding Source	:	ESEA, Title I
Funding Level	:	$756,184
Purpose	:	To establish and maintain a diagnostic/ prescriptive learning program to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties.
Eligibility Requirements	:	Title I children in grades 1 through 12 in twenty-seven non-public schools in Detroit
Number of Students Served	:	Approximately 1400
Location	:	Twenty-seven Non-Public schools-Detroit, Michigan
Number of Professionals	:	Thirty-four
Evaluation	:	The Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation, Research and Evaluation Department, Detroit Public Schools
First Year of Funding	:	1971-72
Program Features	:	The staff provides diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for Title I students referred to them by the teachers and/or the school administration. The students are diagnosed and properly treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and math materials, and staff developed materials are used to meet the needs of each student.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYNOPSIS OF THE EVALUATION i

Brief Description of the Project i
Evaluation Design. ii
Summary of Findings. iii
Recommendations. vi
Conclusion vii

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT. 1

Rationale. 1
Functions and Responsibilities 2
Operation of the Project 2
Monitoring and Documentation 3

II. EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS 4

III. EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 4

IV. PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE EVALUATION. 6

Product Objective #1 6
Product Objective #2 13
Product Objective #3 20
Product Objective #4 24

Process Objective #1 28
Process Objective #2 39
Process Objective #3 44

APPENDICES 50

A. Staff Perceptions of the Learning Center 51
B. Learning Center's Teachers' Perception of the Learning Center 55
C. Parents' Perceptions of the Learning Center. 59
D. In-Service Training Evaluation Instrument. 63

A Synopsis
of
THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS

Brief Description of Project

The Learning Resource Center was established as a method of resolving the problem of working with Title I students who are underachieving in the area of reading and mathematics. These students' learning difficulties and consequent lack of achievement have not been remediated in the normal reading or mathematics laboratory situation.

Approximately fourteen hundred students fit into this category and it is expected they will benefit from center treatment. A concerted effort was made by the Learning Center not only in diagnosing learning problems for target students, but in prescribing those methods which facilitate or improve the acquisition of skills which will ultimately lead to raising their academic levels of achievement in reading and mathematics.

The Learning Resource Center is a diagnostic/prescriptive learning program designed to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties in twenty six Non-Public Schools. The staff consists of three administrators, thirty-four professionals and fifty one school service assistants.

The staff provides diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for students referred to them. The students are treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and mathematics materials, and staff developed materials are used to meet the needs of each student.

Evaluation Design and Results

Evaluation of the Learning Resource Center program for the year-end report relied on results of a pre- and posttest administration of the California Achievement Tests (Grades K-8). Grades 9-12 were preposttested with the Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK). The teachers also used the Stanford Diagnostic Test (Grades 1-12) to assess participating students' learning needs in reading and mathematics skills.

The diagnostic/prescriptive treatment the students receive is geared toward helping the students overcome their learning difficulties so that the emphasis is placed more on the learning process (teaching students how to learn) during their treatment period than on achievement of specific subject matter.

Three questionnaires were constructed and administered to determine attitudes toward and assessment of the Learning Resource Center program. Another questionnaire was constructed and administered to obtain an appraisal of the effectiveness of the In-service Training program.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following is a summary of the highlights of the project:

A. California Achievement Tests (Reading)

1. Grade 1 gained six months
2. Grade 2 gained ten months
3. Grade 3 gained six months
4. Grade 4 gained six months
5. Grade 5 gained six months
6. Grade 6 gained eight months
7. Grade 7 gained nine months
8. Grade 8 gained eleven months

B. California Achievement Tests (Mathematics)

1. Grade 1 gained six months
2. Grade 2 gained six months
3. Grade 3 gained seven months
4. Grade 4 gained six months
5. Grade 5 gained five months
6. Grade 6 gained ten months
7. Grade 7 gained eight months
8. Grade 8 gained five months

C. Stanford Test of Academic Skills (Reading)

1. Grade 9 showed an increase of 13 percentile points
2. Grade 10 showed an increase of 11 percentile points
3. Grade 11 showed an increase of 10 percentile points
4. Grade 12 showed an increase of 14 percentile points

D. Stanford Test of Academic Skills (Mathematics)

1. Grade 9 showed an increase of 10 percentile points

2. Grade 10 showed an increase of 9 percentile points

3. Grade 11 (No data were available)

4. Grade 12 (No data were available)

E. Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

1. One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center's services were helpful to their school.

2. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents indicated that most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.

3. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the respondents indicated that the administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.

4. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving reading and mathematics skills of participating pupils.

5. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents have indicated that the participating pupils enjoyed going to the Learning Resource Center.

6. Ninety-three percent (93%) of the respondents indicated that the consultant was very helpful to them.

7. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.

8. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the participants indicated that the Learning Resource Center teachers were readily available to them.

9. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the participants indicated that would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.

F. Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center Teachers

1. One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been helpful to their school.

2. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the respondents indicated that most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.

3. Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils reading and mathematics skills.

4. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.

5. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the respondents indicated that the Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.

6. Ninety-two percent (92%) of the respondents indicated that the school service assistants were very helpful in the Learning Resource Center.

7. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the participants indicated that the administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.

8. Ninety-four percent (94%) of the participants indicated that pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center.

G. Parents' Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center

1. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the parents indicated that the Learning Resource Center Staff have been successful in improving their children's attitude toward learning.

2. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the parents indicated that their children enjoyed going to the Learning Resource Center.

3. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the parents indicated that their children liked the teachers and aides of the Learning Resource Center.

4. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the parents indicated that the teachers and aides appeared to be sincerely concerned about their children's education.

G. Parents' Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center (continued)

5. Ninety-nine percent (99%) of the parents indicated that they were very pleased that their children attended the Learning Resource Center.

6. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the parents indicated that they had seen improvement in their children's mathematics and reading skills.

7. Ninety-three percent (93%) of the parents indicated that they would like to have more communication with the teachers and aides of the Learning Resource Center.

8. Ninety percent (90%) of the parents indicated that they would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center.

H. Staff Perceptions of the In-Service Training Workshops

1. Ninety-five percent (95%) of the respondents indicated that the Analysis of the Workshop Design was very good.

2. Ninety-three percent (93%) of the respondents indicated that the Workshop Procedures were very good.

3. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the responderts indicated that the Workshop Content was very good.

4. Ninety-three percent (93%) of the respondents indicated that the consultants were very good.

5. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the respondents indicated that the Workshop Outcomes were very good.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the general conclusions drawn from the data of this evaluation and the evaluator's observations, the following recommendations regarding the Learning Resource Center are :

1. Efforts should be made to continue to offer in-service training for the school service assistants in "Developmental Approach to Diagnostic/ Prescriptive Teaching."

2. Efforts should be made to continue to offer in-service training for the teachers in "Developmental Approach to Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teaching."

3. Efforts should be made to inform each school staff with guidelines regarding the Learning Resource Center and Title I Rules and Regulations.

4. Efforts should be made to have a better communication with the classroom teachers regarding their students in the Learning Resource Center.

5. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops in mathematics and reading for the school service assistants.

6. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops in the different areas as indicated by the staff.

7. Efforts should be made to supervise school service assistants while they perform instructional duties in every school.

8. Efforts should be made to test all students in the beginning of the school year with diagnostic tests in reading and mathematics.

9. Efforts should be made to inform the parents of the target students about the Learning Resource Center and how they can be helpful to their children at home.

10. Efforts should be made to offer in-service training workshops for the parents at the Learning Resource Center.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the procedures used to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in terms of the assessment by the participants of the various aspects of their involvement, the findings showed that the project was effective in implementing the activities and in achieving the objectives. The evaluator strongly recommends that the program should be continued and attempts should be made to follow through with the recommendations.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Rationale

In the Non-Public Schools the Learning Resource Centers were established as a method of resolving the problem of working with Title I students who are underachieving in the area of reading and mathematics. These students' learning difficulties and consequent lack of achievement had not been remediated in the normal reading or mathematics laboratory situation.

Approximately one thousand four hundred students fit into this category and it was expected they would benefit from center treatment. A concerted effort was made by the Learning Resource Centers not only in diagnosing learning problems for target students, but in prescribing those methods which would facilitate or improve the acquisition of skills which in turn will ultimately lead to raising their academic levels of achievement in reading and mathematics.

The Learning Resource Center is a diagnostic/prescriptive-learning program designed to recognize and provide for students with extreme learning difficulties in twenty-six Non-Public Title I Schools. The staff consisted of three administrators, fifty-one school service assistants and thirty-four teachers.

The staff provided diagnostic/prescriptive treatment for students referred to them. The students are treated individually or in small groups in their own schools. Perceptual training materials, individualized reading and mathematics materials, and staff developed materials were used to meet the needs of each student.

Functions and Responsibilities

The functions and responsibilities of the Learning Resource Centers were to:

1. Diagnose specific learning difficulties
2. Write and implement prescriptive measures for remediation of handicaps
3. Develop and implement pre-service programs for teachers who will diagnose, remediate, and evaluate such learning difficulties
4. Develop a plan for communicating information about the Learning Center to schools, community, parents of enrollees and other affected personnel
5. Collect, organize, analyze, and report information regarding student progress
6. Develop and maintain a resource material center for parents and teachers involved in the program

Operation of the Project

As a means of accomplishing the functions and responsibilities as specified above the following strategies were designed and carried out during the 1979-80 school year and will also be continued by the Learning Resource Center during 1980-81:

A. Eligibility Defined

The Learning Resource Center will be available to any student who is eligible to receive Title I services.

B. Referral Process

The process for student referral to the Learning Resource Center will require the following procedures:

1. Each school will establish a screening team comprised of professional staff members and supportive service personnel to determine a student's need for Learning Resource Center services.
2. Offical referral must be initiated by the local school principal
3. Referrals will be made to the Learning Resource Center teachers

C. Diagnostic/Prescriptive Procedures

The following are the outlined procedures to be followed by Learning Center staff:

1. Letter is sent to parents informing them of their child's selection for the program
2. Administration of diagnostic devices
3. Staffing for evaluation of findings and development of prescription which may include supportive services
4. Implementation of prescription
5. Feedback to parents and referring teachers
6. Evaluation of prescription with revisions as needed
7. Final evaluation
8. Dissemination of results

D. Parental Involvement

Conferences are held with the parents of the students who are accepted for Learning Resource Center services. In-service training specifically designed to meet the needs of parents is conducted at the Learning Resource Center.

Monitoring and Documentation

Anecdotal and daily logs are kept by all Learning Resource Center staff members. Data related to students involved in the program are collected, organized, analyzed, and reported regarding their progress.

On-site visitations are conducted by the center director to do the following:

a. Observe and assist teachers in the Learning Resource Center

b. Observe selected Title I students within the classroom setting as a means of assisting classroom teachers in determining a strategy for working with students with severe learning problems

Project operation is continually reassessed and adjusted on the basis of monitoring the program.

EVALUATION DESIGN AND RESULTS

Evaluation of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center program for the year-end report relied on results of a pre- and posttest administration of the California Achievement Tests (CAT), and Stanford Diagnostic Test. These test results are presented for the purpose of giving as complete a test profile of the students as possible.

The diagnostic/prescriptive treatment the students received was geared toward helping the students overcome their learning difficulties so that the emphasis was placed more on the learning process (teaching students how to learn) during their treatment period than on achievement of specific subject matter.

Three questionnaires were constructed and administered to obtain Learning Resource Center teachers, parents, and staff attitudes as well as their assessment of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center program. Another questionnaire was constructed to assess the in-service training of the Learning Resource Center teachers.

EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Appropriate screening and diagnostic instruments were administered and students were selected for prescriptive treatment. The average duration of treatment for participating students was six months.

All students accepted for the diagnostic/prescriptive services of the Learning Resource Center are tested to assess their reading and mathematics skills. This testing provides the consultants with information on the student's academic needs. All students accepted in this program have demonstrated an inability to learn in the regular classroom despite the best efforts of their teachers. Additional testing is done to determine the most efficient way to teach the individual student before a prescription is developed for therapeutic tutoring. All children in the Learning Resource Center were tested with the California Achievement Tests in grades 1-8, and Stanford Test of Academic Skills (TASK) in grades 9-12.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE EVALUATION

A. Product Objective #1

1. Individuals - Approximately 1162 students, grades 1-8
2. Behavior - will show significant gain
3. Object of Behavior - in reading
4. Time - September 1979 to June 1980
5. Criterion for Success - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in reading skills for each month of program participation (7 months).

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October 1979
   Posttest: April 1980
2. Participants - These students were selected by staff and principals of each school. Approximately 1162 students, grades 1-8 were selected for the Learning Resource Center.
3. Non-participants - No non-participants were involved in a comparison group.
4. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.
5. Analysis Technique - The number of participants who gain at least one month in reading achievement for each month of program participation will be tabulated.
6. Instrument - California Achievement Tests, Grade 1-8 (Reading).
7. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in reading skills for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement

CAT - Reading

a. Grade 1 gained six months

b. Grade 2 gained ten months

c. Grade 3 gained six months

d. Grade 4 gained six months

e. Grade 5 gained six months

f. Grade 6 gained eight months

g. Grade 7 gained nine months

h. Grade 8 gained eleven months

There were six hundred three or (52%) of the students who gained more than one month in reading skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Tables 1-8

TABLE 1

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 1

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	119	.7
Posttest	119	1.3
Gain		.6

TABLE 2

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 2

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	157	1.6
Posttest	157	2.6
Gain		1.0

TABLE 3

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 3

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	160	.7
Posttest	160	2.4
Gain		.6

TABLE 4

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 4

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	161	2.6
Posttest	161	3.2
Gain		.6

TABLE 5

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 5

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	161	3.0
Posttest	161	3.6
Gain		.6

TABLE 6

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 6

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	168	4.0
Posttest	168	4.8
Gain		.8

TABLE 7

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 7

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	149	4.7
Posttest	149	5.6
Gain		.9

TABLE 8

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 8

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	87	5.1
Posttest	87	6.2
Gain		1.1

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Product Objective #2

1. Individuals - Approximately 629 students, grades 1-8

2. Behavior - will show significant gains

3. Object of Behavior - in mathematics

4. Time - September 1979 to June 1980

5. Criterion for Success - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation (6 months).

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October 1979
   Posttest: April 1980

2. Participants - These students were slected by the staff and principal of each school. Approximately 629 students grade 1-8 were selected for the Learning Resource Center.

3. Non-Participants - No non-participants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that the project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

5. Analysis Technique - The number of participants who gain at least one month in mathematics achievement for each month of program participation will be tabulated.

6. Instrument - California Achievement Tests - Grades 1-8 (Mathematics).

7. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least fifty percent of the students in the program will gain one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation.

2. Results Statement:

CAT - Mathematics

a. Grade 1 gained six months

b. Grade 2 gained six months

c. Grade 3 gained seven months

d. Grade 4 gained six months

e. Grade 5 gained five months

f. Grade 6 gained ten months

g. Grade 7 gained eight months

h. Grade 8 gained five months

There were three hundred nineteen or (51%) of the students who gained more than one month in mathematics skills for each month of program participation.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Tables 9-16

TABLE 9

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 1

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	57	.8
Posttest	57	1.4
Gain		.6

TABLE 10

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 2

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	74	1.4
Posttest	74	2.0
Gain		.6

TABLE 11

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 3

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	76	2.3
Posttest	76	3.0
Gain		.7

TABLE 12

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOUCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 4

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	81	3.1
Posttest	81	3.7
Gain		.6

TABLE 13

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER

GRADE 5

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	76	3.7
Posttest	76	4.2
Gain		.5

TABLE 14

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 6

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	112	4.4
Posttest	112	5.4
Gain		1.0

TABLE 15

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 7

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	104	5.5
Posttest	104	6.3
Gain		.8

TABLE 16

CALIFORNIA ACHIEVEMENT TESTS RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS
LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 8

Test	Mean of Scores in Grade Equivalent Units	
	N	Mean
Paragraph Meaning		
Pretest	49	6.2
Posttest	49	6.7
Gain		.5

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

Although the objective was achieved only one half of the students achieved it. Efforts should be made to work more closely with these students and raise the number of students to achieve the objective.

A. Product Objective #3

1. Individuals - Approximately 188 students, grades 9-12

2. Behavior - will show gain

3. Object of Behavior - in reading

4. Time - September 1979 to June 1980

5. Criterion for Success - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of 45% in percentile points.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October 1979
   Posttest: May 1980

2. Participants - These students were selected by staff and principal of each school. Approximately 188 students, grades 9-12 were selected for the Learning Resource Center for reading.

3. Non Participants - No non-participants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

5. Analysis Technique - The data will be tabulated and calculated by grade. The data will indicate the mean of percentile gains.

6. Instruments - Test of Academic Skills (TASK). Level I & II (Reading)

7. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or only the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of 45% in percentile points.

2. Results Statement

Stanford Test of Academic Skills Test Results (Reading)

a. Grade 9 showed an increase of 13 percentile points

b. Grade 10 showed an increase of 11 percentile points

c. Grade 11 showed an increase of 10 percentile points

d. Grade 12 showed an increase of 14 percentile points

There were 143 (76%) of the students who showed an increase of 45% in percentile points.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Tables 17-20

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

There were 241 students who attended the Learning Resource Center for reading. However, there were 188 who were pre-posttested.

TABLE 17

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 9

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Reading		
Pretest	123	14
Posttest	123	27
Gain		13

TABLE 18

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 10

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Reading		
Pretest	32	19
Posttest	32	30
Gain		11

TABLE 19

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-[illegible]LIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 11

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Reading		
Pretest	21	15
Posttest	21	30
Gain		15

TABLE 20

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 12

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Reading		
Pretest	12	10
Posttest	12	24
Gain		14

A. Product Objective #4

1. Individuals - Approximately 50 students. grades 9-12

2. Behavior - will show gains

3. Object of Behavior - in mathematics

4. Time - September to June 1980

5. Criterion for Success - At least seventy-five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of 45% in percentile points.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Pretest : October 1979
   Posttest: May 1980

2. Participants - These students were selected by the staff and principal of each school. Approximately 50 students grades 9-12 were selected for the Learning Resource Center for mathematics.

3. Non-Participants - No non-participants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Amount of Time Involved - It was estimated that the project participants received four periods of instruction in the Learning Resource Center per week.

5. Analysis Technique - The data will be tabulated and calculated by grade. The data will indicate the mean of percentile gains.

6. Instruments - Test of Academic Skills (TASK). Level I & II Mathematics).

7. Problems - There were a number of students who either took only the pretest or only the posttest. These students were not included in the final data.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - At least seventy five percent of the students in the program will show an average increase of 45% in percentile scores.

C. Evaluation Results (Cont'd)

2. Results Statement

Stanford Test of Academic Skills Test Results - (Mathematics)

a. Grade 9 showed an increase of 10 percentile points

b. Grade 10 showed an increase of 9 percentile points

c. Grade 11 (no data were available)

d. Grade 12 (no data were available)

There were 36 (72%) of the students who showed an increase of 45% in percentile points.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Tables 21-24

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

There were 55 students who attended the Learning Resource Center for mathematics. However, there were 50 students who were pre-posted.

TABLE 21

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 9

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Mathematics		
Pretest	45	21
Posttest	45	31
Gain		10

TABLE 22

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 10

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Mathematics		
Pretest	5	17
Posttest	5	26
Gain		9

TABLE 23

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 11

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Mathematics		
Pretest		
Posttest	(No data were available)	
Gain		

TABLE 24

STANFORD TEST OF ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST RESULTS OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER STUDENTS

GRADE 12

Test	Mean of Percentile Points	
	N	Mean
Mathematics		
Pretest		
Posttest	(No data were available)	
Gain		

A. Process Objective #1

1. Individuals - Target school personnel, teachers, administrators, and school service assistants

2. Behavior - will benefit

3. Object of Behavior - from the Learning Resource Center's teachers

4. Time - September 1979 to June 1980

5. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will response positively toward the Learning Resource Center's services.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Final Evaluation May 1980

2. Participants - One hundred eighty-five teachers, administrators and school service assistants

3. Non-Participants - No non-participants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Analysis Technique - The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on sixteen statements. The responses were computed for the percent of agreement by the respondents and also for the mean of the scores of each statement. The number and percentage of respondents who marked "strongly agree" or "agree" per item are presented in Table 25. Note that the percent is based on the number responding per item. Those who did not answer were excluded in the computation. A scale of one to four was used for the mean of scores. The score of 1 equals "strongly disagree" and the score of 4 equals "strongly agree." The results are displayed in Table 25.

5. Instruments - Staff perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Center (See Appendix A). Learning Resource Center Teachers Perceptions (Appendix B).

6. Problems - No major problems were identified by the staff.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eighty percent of the respondents will respond positively toward the Learning Resource Center services.

2. Results Statement - Ninety percent of the respondents responded positively toward Learning Resource Center. services. The mean score was 3.4.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 25 and 26

TABLE 25

Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
1. The Learning Resource Center's helpful to my school.	185/185	100%	3.7
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	176/185	95	3.5
3. Administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.	181/185	98	3.6
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	178/185	96	3.4
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	176/184	96	3.4
6. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	171/183	93	3.4
7. Teachers have made use of the LRC teachers' services.	168/184	91	3.3
8. The Learning Resource Center's teacher is readily available to me.	181/185	98	3.6

TABLE 25 (Cont'd)

Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
9. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center.	160/183	87%	3.3
10. The initial presentation of the Learning Resource Center was adequate to inform me of its services.	156/180	87	3.3
11. As a result of the Learning Resource Center's input, I have experimented with new and different ideas, equipment, and materials this year.	140/183	77	3.1
12. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.	163/178	92	3.4
13. Participating pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center.	173/183	95	3.4
14. The Learning Resource Center consultant has provided me with adequate information about my student's (students') individualized prescriptive treatment.	159/182	87	3.3
15. The LRC teacher has been helpful to me.	171/184	93	3.4
16. I would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center.	181/185	98	3.5

Finally the respondents were asked to indicate the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center. Following is a summary of their comments:

Strengths

1.	Individualized instruction	(79)
2.	Excellent and helpful teachers and aides	(125)
3.	Excellent rapport of LRC staff and their students	(70)
4.	Development of self-confidence	(78)
5.	Students' improvement of reading skills	(113)
6.	Students' sense of achievement	(92)
7.	Equipment and materials to help the students	(90)
8.	Positive reinforcement	(103)
9.	Small group size	(120)
10.	Pleasant atmosphere	(83)

Weaknesses

1.	Not enough time in LRC	(70)
2.	No feedback to classroom teachers on students progress	(50)
3.	More students need the service of LRC	(120)
4.	Sessions are too short	(43)

Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center. The following are a few of their comments:

> "The program is so valuable. The only weakness it has are the requirements to be in the program. You have to score low enough. I wish we had enough teachers to offer a positive program like this to all students."

> "I think the Reading Resource Center does a marvelous work. The dedicated teachers do everything possible to motivate their pupils and explain well any helps we, their subject teachers, can give them."

"This year we were required to have a LRC teacher; previously the aides were under the direction of the regular classroom teacher. Due to the budget and this chance we went from 5 to 3 aides. Also less students were serviced. The person hired as the LRC teacher came in December and stayed for just a couple of months. The program that had been used up to her arrival was changed and math was eliminated. Upon the LRC teacher's quiting, we stayed with the new program so that there would not be another major change. This was necessary in the first place since what we had was quite successful and more students were serviced by it."

"Quality with the Administration should be involved in placing the students to the Learning Resource Center. It would be more advantageous to have students to follow a sequence of courses at least for 2 years. If needed maybe some students should be assigned there four years in Learning Resource Center."

"I would suggest to have an entrance test for all students who are poor readers. Upon the results, place all these students in various ages to a group and let them be admitted to the Learning Resource Center. Not only to keep them for one semester, but at least for 2 to 3 years as needed."

"It would be great if the center could be expanded to include more children. There are so many children who would have greatly benefited by the center but who either lived outside the boundaries or were slightly above the minimum skill level and the teacher already had filled her quota of children."

"There should be some individualized prescriptive treatment. It would be helpful to classroom teachers to know what the student is working on, as well as what progress he/she is making. Accept students who are not "target" area students. (Some children have trouble in math but not in reading.)"

"I am concerned about the appropriation of funds for this program. It seems strange to me that the teacher can spend hundreds of dollars on equipment, but can't buy cabinets and files in which to store it. Also, with all the money appropriated, why can't the center purchase it's own typewriter and duplicating machines?"

"I am thankful for this area of learning in our school. I believe that, in spite of our loosing 2 teachers this year, the center has operated with the maximal amount of efficiency. The aides are helpful and have a genuine interest of the student at heart. They have been most generous in their service to the students...even to the point of working at extra times with them."

I would like some type of progress report written or oral on how each child is doing and on which skills are being covered during the year."

"I would like to see a program that would supplement our own reading program. This would include a solid phonics approach with emphasis on the same vocabulary that is needed/used in the reading program. Our children do not get much help at home so going over the same materials helps each child to gain a sense of satisfaction in knowing materials, etc."

"All children attending school that need additional help in reading and/or math should be able to receive help from the learning center. Deciding on who needs the most help should be based on test scores and teacher recommendations not addresses."

"Some children who do not live within prescribed boundaries cannot benefit from the learning center's programs. I cannot see why all children attending this school should not be able to benefit from this program."

Perceptions of the Learning Center Teachers and School Service Assistance

There were seventy-seven instruments returned by LRC teachers and school service assistants who commented on sixteen statements dealing with the program. The respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement. The responses were computed for the percent of agreement by the number and percentage of respondents who marked "strongly agree" or "agree" per item are presented in Table 26. Note that percent is based on number responding per item. Those who did not answer were excluded in the computation. A scale of one to four was used for the mean of the scores. The score of 1 equals "strongly disagree" and the score of 4 equals "strongly agree." The results are displayed in Table 26.

TABLE 26

Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center Teachers

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
The Learning Resource Center's services are helpful to my school.	76/76	100%	3.7
Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	67/76	91	3.3
Administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.	74/77	96	3.5
The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	70/70	100	3.6
The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' mathematics skills.	48/50	96	3.4
The Learning Resource Center successful in iminimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	70/72	97	3.3
Teachers have made use of the LRC's teacher services.	62/70	89	3.3
There are more than 20 students I serve each period in the Learning Resource Center.	65/70	93	3.4
The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center to the staff.	47/60	78	3.0
There shouldn't be more than 15 students in each class period in the Learning Resource Center.	70/75	93	3.5

TABLE 26 (Cont'd)

Statements	Number	Percent	Mean of the Scores
11. As a result of the Learning Resource Center's input, I have rxperimented with new and different ideas, equipment, and materials this year.	66/73	90%	3.3
12. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.	75/77	97	3.5
13. Participating pupils enjoy coming to the Learning Resource Center.	72/77	94	3.5
14. The students are very carefully selected for the Learning Resource Center.	70/75	93	3.4
15. The Learning Resource Center is well equipped for both reading and mathematics.	53/68	80	3.2
16. The school service assistants are very helpful in the Learning Resource Center.	61/66	92	3.6

The respondents were asked to indicate strengths, and weaknesses. The following is a summary:

Strengths

1. Good staff with positive attitude (29)
2. Small class size (40)
3. Individualized instruction (47)
4. Cooperation between LRC staff and faculty (25)
5. Positive attitudes of students (33)
6. Positive attitude of parents (40)

Weaknesses

1. Lack of good materials (36)
2. Poor maintenance of equipment (30)
3. Lack of In-service Training for the school service assistants (23)
4. Lack of planning time (21)
5. Lack of In-service Training Workshops (27)

Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center. The following are a few of their comments:

"Need for refresher workshops on behavioral problems, motivational techniques and emotional problems. More insight into learning disabilities and concrete methods to correct such problems."

"There should be more In-service Training for LRC staff. There should be a better understanding of end of the year requirements or expectations for Research and Evaluation Department. There should be some supplies at beginning of year for skills being taught, if possible, work books and stencil masters ran off, paper, etc. Books for reading hand on kind of things."

"1. Need make and take in-service workshops to allow for new ideas to continue. 2. Aides need to meet and be given job description. 3. Teachers need directions on their exact authority over aides."

"Training program needed for teachers and aides, to familiarize them with equipment and methods that could be useful."

"All aides should attend workshops to show them how to handle children. The Archdiocese has a fantastic program. Why don't we join?

"At least have one meeting at the beginning of the school year between LRC and school staff preferably in the LRC. Have administrative expectations for the LRC at the beginning of the school year in writing."

"1. Running the program no later than 12:30 or 1:00. Children come at 8:30. Some take the bus home and arrive home around 3:30. That's extremely long for a kindergarten child. The mental strain will affect their motivation for learning and school. 2. Having no more than 30 pupils. Children demand more attention at this age and more numbers inhibit learning possibilities. Behavior problems, too, many children using facilities caused undue tensions."

"Many children do not like to come to centers. I think that if a progress report went home from the reading center, the children will have more of a positive attitude. By October 1, 1980, we would like to have a written requirement sheet regarding all paper work functions in the LRC room."

"Many of the children that come to the LRC feel and use this time as a fun time. They remark 'I do not get marked in this class, so I don't have to worry.' Maybey a progress report going home or to homeroom teachers would be of some help to give a positive attitude."

"I feel all new personnel should be informed of what is expected of them. A brief summary of what the LRC is all about!"

"School Service Assistants should be briefed on how to go about teaching the students rather than just placing them on the job and saying 'teach.'"

"1. Arrange that either children are taken out of one class totally for a sem./yr. and not graded or a real accomodation in requirements for work missed be given LRC children. This needs strong admin. support as LRC staff cannot control this. 2. Provide regular workshops for teachers. forms testing, etc.; materials workshop prior to ordering. 3. Written communication form administrative staff on all information. 4. Guidelines defined as to role of teacher in establishing LRC program, how to deal effectively with aides in achieving goals (how assertive can we be?). Defining role of aide(s) and what can be expected. 5. Establish a real line of authority on any of problem(s) that might arise, i.e., what type of problem is shared with principal, with Teacher Coordinator with Mr. Karpowitz or any other proper source. 6. Calendar's that followed the school year where working-signed statement as to payroll and no. of days for year. 7. L.D. children's workshop, since we seem to include those children. 8. Time allowed for parent visitation-to include paid time in evening for working parents. 9. A closer working together of all schools and teachers.

"1. Schedule students out of one class that they need not be graded for during a whole semester or year. Make this clear to teachers thru administration that this is procedure, as LRC teachers have no control over this type of thing. (2) Provide workshop for regular (St. Ambrose) teachers explaining that we in LRC, sometimes cover material other than that given in class because we need to backtrack to help w/skills needed prior to those worked on in class. (3) Written communications from 'supervisor' at all times. Same expectations on policy matters and procedures followed regarding such should follow for both supervisors.* (4) Workshops for teachers covering exactly what is expected for tests, record keeping, etc. In 'sharing' workshops, found everyone is 'required' to do different things. (5) Workshops for teachers on proper utilization of aides-what we may not expect them to do, how to be assertive in requiring work to be done w/out seeming overly agressive, etc. (6) Workshops for aides on what they can be expected to do, accepting teacher's direction, etc. (7) Workshops for staff on how to deal with children who are or lean toward being 'learning disabled.'" (8) A realistic calendar that is allowed to jive with the school we are working in, rather than with the Detroit Public Schools. We are a separate program within the Board of Education and are not contracted liked their regular teachers in this? (9) Provide opportunities within our paid days to have parents in to visit the center and see it in operation, or simply discuss the child and his progress. (10) Allow for some paid planning time. (11) Establish what are correct lines of communication (Aierarchy) of authority? For problems that arise.

*Matters presently seem open to too much individual interpretation.

"A few teachers take the liberty to send children quite late, or keep them away for extended periods of time. Sometimes this is used as punishment and sometimes because the classroom teacher wants to use the time to teach other material. I do not feel this indicates proper understanding of the LRC program. Perhaps a handbook of brief 'highlights' would help these teachers. It would be very helpful if a skills - behavior check-list for aides were developed. Examples: (1) knowledge of primary lettering, (2) guidelines for professional record keeping. (i.e., check work with color but keep records and charts in black or blue ink.), (3) knowledge of the extend of an aides responsibilities, (4) knowledge of state and local laws pertaining to matters such as leaving children unattended, 'leading' an aspirin, administering first-aid, being prompt, avoiding personal discussions in the center where children can overhear, having food, beverages, candy, etc., during class times, (5) knowledge pertaining to liability incurred in some above mentioned areas.

A. Process Objective #2

1. Individuals - Parents of participating students

2. Behavior - will benefit

3. Object of Behavior - from the information provided from the LRC

4. Time - September, 1979 to June, 1980

5. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will respond positively toward the LRC.

B. Evaluation Procedures

1. Type - Final evaluation questionnaires, May, 1980.

2. Participants - Three hundred two parents of participating students.

3. Nonparticipants - No nonparticipants were involved in a comparison group.

4. Analysis Technique - A questionnaire, designed to determine parents' attitude toward and assessment of the Learning Resource Center program and services was administered during the last week of May, 1980.

   The data collected by the questionnaire are presented in Table 27. The data were given the same statistical treatment as the teacher questionnaire.

   There were two hundred eleven instruments returned by parents of participating students, who commented on the statements dealing with the program. The respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statements. The number and percentage of respondents who marked "yes" on each item are presented in Table 27. Note that the percent is based on the number responding per item. Those who did not answer were excluded in the computation.

5. Instruments - Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center-Parent (see Appendix C).

6. Problems - No problems were identified with the parents. However, more parents could have been involved.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate the Learning Center and the In-service Training Workshops satisfactory.

2. Results Statement - The mean average of fifteen statements concerning effectiveness of the Learning Center was 87%.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 27.

TABLE 27

Parents Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent
1. The Learning Resource Center's staff have been successful in improving my child's attitude toward learning.	269/279	96%
2. My child enjoys going to the Learning Resource Center.	280/293	96
3. The Learning Resource Center's staff have provided me with adequate information about my child's achievement.	232/302	77
4. My child likes the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	272/282	97
5. The teacher and aides appear to be sincerely concerned about my child's education.	283/291	97
6. I am pleased that my child is attending the Learning Resource Center.	298/302	99
7. I would like to have my child continue in the Learning Resource Center if it is at all possible.	287/296	97
8. I have seen some improvement in my child's reading skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	291/298	98

TABLE 27 (Cont'd)

Parents Perceptions of the Learning Resource Center

Statements	Number	Percent
9. I have seen some improvement in my child's mathematics skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	282/289	96%
10. I have noticed that my child is more willing to read at home since being part of the Learning Resource Center.	227/267	85
11. I would like to see my child spend more time in the Learning Resource Center.	237/268	88
12. I would like to have more communication with the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	260/278	93
13. I would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center.	271/300	90
14. I would like to attend workshops for parents in the Learning Resource Center.	147/238	62
15. I have visited and observed the activities at the Learning Resource Center.	128/300	43

Finally, the paretns were asked to indicate any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center. The following are some of their comments:

> "I feel the staff of our Learning Resource Center is excellent and they have made my son enjoy learning. The work and patience of these dedicated people is highly appreciated and has made a large difference to my son's education."
>
> "I'm very pleased with my son, Dennis' reading. He has improved greatly since he has been going to the Learning Resource Center. The only suggestion I have is I would like for him to bring his papers home, he has brought home books to read and enjoys reading more now than ever before."

"The program seems very interesting, maybe it is the best class in the school. All times I go there to the school, the teachers will take a hour to talk to me. She is very good with my child."

"What is the criteria for a student to attend the LRC? Would a conversation between parents and LRC personnel be of use before a student is assigned to LRC? Or at least early in her attendance there. My daughter's math skills have improved remarkably since her attendance at LRC but her cognitive reading skills seem to me to be about the same. I believe this is in line with the handicaps associated with hyperkinesis. I would like to know if the LRC sees a difference. I'd also be interested in knowing the methods used in the LRC to improve the reading skills. Nicole enjoys her experience in the LRC and we have noted real improvement in her math skills especially. We are happy she is attending the center."

"The Learning Resource Center is very important to the development of my children as well as other children. In that it increases their abilities to learn on a one to one ratio in a less competative environment. Plus there are numerous other benefits from this program. Lets keep it in our school."

"I believe it would be a good idea for all interested parents to have a chance to observe the learning resource at least on one occassion when the child is in full operation of class time. I have much faith in the learning technique because my child Michelle LaDuke has improved and is in full knowledge of her reading skills. Now she needs much help to fully understand mathematics on her grade level. Our children in St. Hyacinth must forfeit regular class time in order to get help in remedial reading or math. I wish there could be a system devised where these special children could receive the help needed during such time when they don't have to miss out on regular class time. I believe in the program and hope any changes that could benefit my child or any other child can be made by the next coming school year."

"I think that the Holy Trinity kindergarden has really helped my two boys. They know how to explain what they are doing in school also they enjoy what they have done in the school. Which I personally think is very important. Thank you for providing Holy Trinity with such a fine kindergarden."

"I am very glad for the center because my children have very much improved. Would like more parents and child worksheets to do at home together. I would like to know of more ways that I could help them with their learning.

"I would like to see that the learning center help the children over the summer at least twice a week."

"I think they are doing a wonderful job. They are very compassionate and understanding. My child comes home with lists of spelling words and is very anxious to learn to spell them and has taken a great interest in reading and he is so proud because he can read words he never could before."

"Provides parents with the information that their child is involved in this type of program, and keep us informed of their progress. This is the first we have heard of such a program, and up until now we were not aware that our child was involved. If we erred it is our mistake, however, if we were not informed someone is in err."

"I think it would be nice for the parent and child attend reading class or mathematic classes together. Then maybe it will be a bit easy for the parent to help teach (his or her) child according to the teacher ways."

"In regard to question 11 - I wouldn't mind my son spending more time in the Learning Center as long as it doesn't interfere with his regular school work."

"I would be interested in attending workshops if they could be scheduled for the weekend. I would like to know results of test given at the beginning of the school year."

"No suggestions. Just a comment. Before my son went to the learning center, he hated math. Now he feels confident in math. He even makes up problems at home to show me. I am very grateful to the math learning center at Eastside Vicareate.

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

Efforts should be made to inform the target parents about the services provided for them and their children.

A. Process Objective #3

1. Individuals - Learning Resource Center staff

2. Behavior - will receive

3. Objective of Behavior - in-service training

4. Time - September 1979 to June 1980

5. Measurement - Project records and In-service Training Instruments

6. Criterion for Success - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate In-service Training Workshop satisfactory.

B. Evaluation, Design, Procedures

1. Type - Final evaluation questionnaires.

2. Participants - Learning Resource Center staff.

3. Amount of Time Involved - About three hours per workshop.

4. Analysis Technique - There were forty-five instruments returned by staff members who commented on sixteen different statements dealing with in-service training workshops. A five point scale was used to rate the in-service training. "Low" was indicated with number "1" and "High" was indicated with number "5." Means of the responses were computed. The results are displayed in Table 28.

5. Instruments - a. Records and logs.
b. In-service Evaluation Questionnaire (See Appendix D).

6. Problems - It has been very difficult to set up workshops during the school year.

C. Evaluation Results

1. Criterion - Eighty percent of the respondents will rate the In-service Training Workshops satisfactory.

2. Results Statement - a. The mean positive average concerning effectiveness of the In-service Training was 93.

b. In a five point scale the mean of the scores was 3.3.

D. The objective was achieved.

E. Data

See Table 28

TABLE 28

Final Evaluation In-Service Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP DESIGN			
1. There was sufficient time to achieve the workshop's stated objectives.	44/45	98%	3.6
2. The physical setting and facilities were suitable for the workshop functions.	36/41	88	3.3
3. The day, time of day, and/or general timing of the workshop was appropriate for its purpose.	40/42	95	3.4
4. The workshop activities were well structured and organized.	32/33	97	3.5
WORKSHOP PROCEDURES			
1. The training procedures used in the workshop were appropriate to its goals.	32/35	91	3.3
2. The training format provided ample opportunities for active involvement and personal interaction with the consultants and other participants.	33/37	89	3.2
3. The size of the workshop training group was about right for its purpose.	39/39	100	3.4

TABLE 28 (Cont'd)

Final Evaluation In-Service Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
WORKSHOP CONTENT			
1. The workshop goals and objectives were clearly defined and presented.	36/38	95%	3.3
2. Workshop discussions were centered on topics directly related to the workshop goals.	36/37	97	3.5
CONSULTANT(S) SERVICES			
1. The consultants were knowledgeable and skillful in their presentation and program activities.	37/39	95	3.4
2. The consultants proceeded at a moderate enough pace allowing for a clear understanding by the participants.	35/45	78	3.0
3. The consultants were genuinely concerned with the progress of the participants.	38/38	100	3.5
4. The consultants' program activities were planned and presented in agreement with your perception of the workshop goals and objectives.	36/36	100	3.4
WORKSHOP OUTCOMES			
1. There was considerable agreement between the workshop's stated objectives and what I actually gained.	34/37	92	3.3
2. The ideas presented were applicable to my needs.	32/37	86	3.2

TABLE 28 (Cont'd)

Final Evaluation In-Service Training Instrument

Statements	Number of Respondents	Percent of Positive Responses	Mean of the Scores
WORKSHOP OUTCOMES (Cont'd)			
3. The presentations stimulated further thought and interest in my daily working situation.	31/36	86%	3.2
4. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be used in my instruction.	30/32	94	3.3
5. Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be shared with my colleagues.	32/35	91	3.3
6. Others should be encouraged to be a part of this type of inservice.	30/32	94	3.2

The respondents were also asked to comment on strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for improving future workshops. The results are as follows:

Strengths of the Workshop

Consultants	(24)
Materials and/or exercises	(21)
Director	(11)
Group Participants	(17)
Goals and Objectives	(14)

Weaknesses of the Workshop

There were no major weaknesses indicated by the respondents. However, some of the respondents made the following comments and suggestions:

Suggestions for Future Workshops:

"These workshops were arranged to provide the teachers with ideas as to what's available for Reading Laboratories. However, I feel workshops providing more insight into motivational behavioral techniques are needed."

"Please allow for future workshops that shows us a universal method to be used for papers, tecords such as logs, reporting to parents, tec. Need workshops on parent involvement ideas."

"The workshops should be geared toward training teachers and aides in the duties and responsibilities they will perform in their jobs. The workshops should also give insight into new teaching methods in Reading and Math (as far as remediation is concerned) also workshops on student behavior and motivation techniques."

"The teachers who are just beginning have very different needs from those who have been teaching for years. Perhaps teachers new to the program need to be shown how to code in test information, but I doubt that it is needed by every teacher every year. Years ago I attended a workshop ran by teachers which was a 'hands on' experience in development of teacher-made materials. I have always remembered this as the best of my workshop experiences. I would like special workshops for aides which would include:

1. definition of an aide
2. job description
3. work expectations
4. the difference in professional and other relationships to children
5. legal restrictions
   a. unattended children
   b. first aide, etc.
6. difference in roles of teacher and aides
7. importance of business like attitudes and practices
   a. promptness
   b. avoidance of personal discussions where children can overhear
   c. behavior appropriate for lunch break and other breaks is not appropriate during class.
8. terminilogy of reading remediation
9. primary manuscript
10. professional, efficient, accurate recording keeping

"I enjoy the workshops thoroughly and gained many ideas to use myself. However, a different system for assigning workshop content might be much more valuable to participants such as myself. Title I teachers from different school have a lot to offer in terms of how they choose to operate their own centers. But since directives are not uniform to all, we are only made aware of other possibilities, and are not necessarily allowed to put into practice ideas that we like. I also think workshops where we meet as a whole, rather than in small groups, are very useful so that information is not misconstrued or subject to individual interpretation before it is passed on to us."

"Some topics I would consider valuable for workshops:

Nature of the LRC, its functions, and the roles of teachers and parapros in the program.

Description of the LRC teacher's and parapro's functions and responsibility.

Classroom managements techniques.

Recording data: procedures, amount of time practical to be spent on such, exactly which information and forms are necessary, and which are paperwork that can be dispensed with, etc.

Techniques for utilizing aides effectively.

Aides' follow-up on teacher directives.

Learning disabilities

Directives on scheduling: length of classes, number of meetings, low adaptable to the school's schedule we can be, methods of working around the classroom teacher's objective, etc."

F. Supplementary Analysis

No supplementary analysis was made for this objective.

G. Conclusion

The workshop ratings were very positive. However, it is very difficult to have workshops with the whole staff at the same time. It is highly recommended that efforts should be made to offer inservice training workshops for professional and paraprofessional staff.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Staff Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Center

Detroit Public Schools	STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Resource Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Resource Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Resource Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Resource Center. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

1. Name of School:_____ 2. Date:_____

3. Position:

- ☐ Teacher or Counselor
- ☐ School Service Assistant
- ☐ Administrator

4. Level of your school:

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Middle
- ☐ High

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - Strongly Agree: You strongly agree with the statement.

A - Agree: You agree more than you disagree.

D - Disagree: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - Strongly Disagree: You strongly disagree with the statement.

NA - Not Applicable: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel this statement does not apply or you simply cannot answer the question.

1. The Learning Resource Center's services are helpful to my school.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. Administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
6. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
7. Teachers have made use of the Learning Resource Center's teacher services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
8. The Learning Resource Center's teacher is readily available to me.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
9. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
10. The initial presentation of the Learning Resource Center was adequate to inform me of its services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
11. As a result of the Learning Resource Center's input, I have experimented with new and different ideas, equipment, and materials this year.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
12. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

13. Participating pupils enjoy going to the Learning Resource Center. SA A D SD NA

14. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has provided me with adequate information about my student's individualized prescriptive treatment. SA A D SD NA

15. The Learning Resource Center's teacher has been helpful to me. SA A D SD NA

16. I would refer another child who needed help to the Learning Resource Center. SA A D SD NA

17. What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center?

Strengths:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Weaknesses:

1.

2.

3.

4.

18. Please make any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center.

APPENDIX B

Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools
Learning Center Teachers

Detroit Public Schools	LRC'S STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF THE TITLE I LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Resource Center is to provide meaningful programs which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Learning Resource Center is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the Learning Resource Center. This activity is intended to take approximately five to ten minutes.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Learning Resource Center. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Learning Resource Center.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

1. Name of School:_____ 2. Date:_____

3. Position:

- ☐ Teacher or Counselor
- ☐ School Service Assistant

4. Level of your school:

- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ High

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT.

SA - Strongly Agree: You strongly agree with the statement.

A - Agree: You agree more than you disagree.

D - Disagree: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - Strongly Disagree: You strongly disagree with the statement.

NA - Not Applicable: Does not apply or don't know. Circle this when you feel this statement does not apply or you simply cannot answer the question.

1. The Learning Resource Center's services are helpful to my school.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2. Most teachers have a positive attitude toward the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3. Administrators have accepted the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
4. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' reading skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
5. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving participating pupils' math skills.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
6. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in minimizing participating pupils' learning difficulties.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
7. Teachers have made use of the Learning Resource Center's teacher services.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
8. There should be more in-service training for the Learning Resource Center's staff.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
9. The school administration has explained the services of the Learning Resource Center to the staff.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
10. There shouldn't be more than 15 students in each class period in the Learning Resource Center.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
11. As a result of the Learning Resource Center's input, I have experimented with new and different ideas, equipment, and materials this year.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

12. The Learning Resource Center has been successful in improving attitudes of participating pupils toward learning. SA A D SD NA

13. Participating pupils enjoy coming to the Learning Resource Center. SA A D SD NA

14. The students are very carefully selected for the Learning Resource Center. SA A D SD NA

15. The Learning Resource Center is well equipped for both reading and math. SA A D SD NA

16. The school service assistants are very helpful in the Learning Resource Center. SA A D SD NA

17. What were the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Learning Resource Center?

Strengths:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Weaknesses:

1.

2.

3.

4.

18. Please make any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center.

APPENDIX C

Parent's Perceptions of the Non-Public Schools Learning Resource Center

Detroit Public Schools	NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	Research and Evaluation Department

Dear Parent:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain your evaluation of the services provided to you and your child by the Learning Resource Center.

An evaluation of each of the projects supported by funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I is required under terms of the contract between the Detroit Board of Education and the Funding Agency.

I would be extremely grateful to you if you would take your time and effort to help with this important evaluation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mike Syropoulos

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D.
Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Department

Name of school your child is attending _____

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE TO EACH STATEMENT ---
YES - NO - or DON'T KNOW (doesn't apply)

Please indicate how characteristic (or true) each statement is of the teacher and/or aides of the Learning Resource Center:

1. The Learning Resource Center's staff have been successful in improving my child's attitude toward learning.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
2. My child enjoys going to the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
3. The Learning Resource Center's staff have provided me with adequate information about my child's achievement.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
4. My child likes the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
5. The teacher and aides appear to be sincerely concerned about my child's education.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
6. I am pleased that my child is attending the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
7. I would like to have my child continue in the Learning Resource Center if it is at all possible.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
8. I have seen some improvement in my child's reading skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
9. I have seen some improvement in my child's mathematics skills since he/she has been in the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
10. I have noticed that my child is more willing to read at home since being part of the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
11. I would like to see my child spend more time in the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
12. I would like to have more communication with the teacher and aides of the Learning Resource Center.	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW

13. I would like to know more about the Learning Resource Center. YES NO DON'T KNOW

14. I would like to attend workshops for parents in the Learning Resource Center. YES NO DON'T KNOW

15. I have visited and observed the activities at the Learning Resource Center. YES NO DON'T KNOW

16. Please note any suggestions for improving the Learning Resource Center services.

APPENDIX D

In-Service Training Evaluation Instrument

Detroit Public Schools	FINAL EVALUATION INSERVICE TRAINING WORKSHOPS	Research and Evaluation Department

The basic purpose of the Learning Center is to provide meaningful inservice programs for professional and paraprofessional staff members (and parents) which will lead to improved performance by Title I target population pupils.

In seeking to achieve this goal, an evaluation of the Inservice Training Worshops is conducted in order to gain information relative to its strengths and weaknesses. The ESEA, Title I, federal agency which provides funds for the Center's operation requires such an evaluation.

Therefore, your assistance is needed to provide information based on your personal assessment of the effectiveness of the total Inservice Training Workshop you have attended during the 1978-79 school year.

Consider for a moment your own position and feelings regarding the Inservice Training. Then please react to <u>each</u> of the following statements or questions as they apply to you. Your frank reactions will provide us with useful information which can be used to improve the Inservice Training.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Mike Syropoulos, Ed.D
Evaluator, Research and
Evaluation Department

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH STATEMENT .

SA - Strongly Agree: You strongly agree with statement.

A - Agree: You agree more than you disagree.

D - Disagree: You disagree more than you agree.

SD - Strongly Disagree: You strongly disagree with statement.

NA - Not Applicable: Does not apply or don't know. Circle when you feel This statement does not apply, or you simply cannot answer the question.

ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP DESIGN

1.	There was sufficient time to achieve the workshop's(s') stated objectives.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2.	The physical setting and facilities were suitable for the workshop functions.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3.	The day, time of day, and/or general timing of the workshop(s) was appropriate for its purpose.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
4.	The workshop(s') activities were well structured and organized.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

WORKSHOP PROCEDURES

1.	The training procedures used in the workshop(s) were appropriate to its goals.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2.	The training format provided ample opportunities for active involvement and personal interaction with the consultants and other participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
3.	The size of the workshop(s) training group(s) was about right for its purpose.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

WORKSHOP CONTENT

1.	The workshop(s) goals and objectives were clearly defined and presented.	SA	A	D	SD	NA
2.	Workshop discussions were centered on topics directly related to the workshop goals.	SA	A	D	SD	NA

CONSULTANT(S) SERVICES

1.	The consultants were knowledgeable and skillful in their presentation and implementation of the program activities.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
2.	The consultants proceeded at a moderate enough pace allowing for a clear understanding by the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
3.	The consultants were genuinely concerned with the progress of the participants.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
4.	The consultants program activities were planned and presented in agreement with your perception of the workshop goals and objectives.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____

WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

1.	There was considerable agreement between the workshop's stated objectives and what I actually gained.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
2.	The ideas presented were appropriate for my backgrounds and needs.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
3.	The presentations stimulated further thought and interest in my daily working situation.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
4.	Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be used in my instruction.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
5.	Most of the ideas gained in the workshop(s) will be shared with my colleagues.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____
6.	Others should be encouraged to be a part of this type of inservice.	SA	A	D	SD	NA	_____

7. How many workshops and/or conferences did you attend during the 1978-79 school year? _____

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

What were the strengths of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants ☐ Director ☐

Materials and/or exercises ☐ Group Participants ☐

Audiovisual materials (if any) ☐ Goals and Objectives ☐

Other ☐ (please explain) _____

What were the weaknesses of the workshops? Please check:

Consultants ☐ Director ☐

Materials and/or exercises ☐ Group Participants ☐

Audiovisual materials (if any) ☐ Goals and Objectives ☐

Other ☐ (please explain) _____

Please note any suggestions for improving future workshops.
(Use other side if necessary.)